

REMARKS

Claims 1-16, as amended, are pending in this application. In this Response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the address of the packet received by the receiving station is not updated when the judgment is false. In addition, claim 14 has been amended to correct a formality. As no new matter has been added by the amendments herein, Applicant respectfully requests entry of these amendments at this time.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,661,999 to Johnson *et al.* ("Johnson") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0112803 to Matsugatani *et al.* ("Matsugatani") for the reasons set forth on pages 2-9 of the Office Action. Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 3-13 and 15-16 under § 103(a) as being obvious over Johnson in view of Matsugatani and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0002063 to Miyamoto *et al.* ("Miyamoto"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome.

In the Office Action, the Examiner highlights the fact that Matsugatani discloses forwarding the packet received by the receiving section without updating the address. However, as disclosed in Para. 0011 and 0012 of Matsugatani, two different addresses exist and are used concurrently. That is, one is an address for radio communication, which is a temporary terminal address that changes when the segment for communication is switched from one to the other. The other address is an address for data communication, which is constant, even if the segment is switched from one to the other.

In contrast, only one address exists at the same time in the present invention, and the address forwards the packet received by the receiving section without updating the address to another radio base station adjacent to a local station. Thus, the present invention is completely different from the invention disclosed by Matsugatani. One of the unique features of claim 1 of the present invention is that it forwards the packet received by the receiving section without updating the address of the packet when the packet does not belong to the address of the local station at the time of handover. This means that the present invention judges whether or not a packet belongs to the range of addresses at the local station. Then, if a packet belongs to the range of addresses at the local station, routing is conducted at the local station. If, however, the

packets don't belong to the range of addresses at the local station, they are forwarded to another radio base station adjacent to the local station.

In addition, Johnson only discloses that a new address is obtained after a handover to a different base station is made. In sum, for at least the reasons set forth above, neither Johnson nor Matsugatani, either alone or in combination, disclose the features of the present invention recited by claims 1, 2, and 14. Miyamoto also fails to cure the deficiencies of Johnson and Matsugatani discussed above. As such, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the present amendments and remarks still do not resolve all of the issues regarding patentability of the pending claims, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorneys to discuss any remaining issues.

A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith extending the time period for response two months to and including August 19, 2008. No other fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any fee be required, however, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-4545, Order No. 5261-005-US01.

Respectfully submitted,
Hanify & King, P.C.

Dated: July 22, 2008

By: 
Siddhesh V. Pandit, Registration No. 58,572
Hanify & King, P.C.
1875 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 403-2104 Telephone
(202) 429-4380 Facsimile